

C. Remarks

In a telephone call with the undersigned on May 21, 2003, Examiner Tolin agreed to call the undersigned at 408/982-8203 before taking action on the above-identified application. Specifically, most of the currently outstanding rejections relate to use of the word "annular" in the claims being rejected. In fact, the Examiner had indicated in the Office Action dated April 10, 2003 that Claims 19-29 and 31-43 which were rejected for reciting "annular" were "not rejected on art" (see paragraph 8 on the top of page 3 of the just-described Office Action). The only claim rejected over the art was Claim 30 which is now canceled.

Applicant has amended Claims 19-29 and 31-43 to eliminate the word "annular", in accordance with the Examiner's remark at the end of paragraph 3 on page 2 of the Office Action. By doing so, the scope of Claims 19-29 and 31-43 has now been broadened. Applicant believes the just-described claims cover both circular regions and non-annular regions, and request the Examiner to confirm that the claim scope is broadened.

In the above-mentioned telephone call, Examiner Tolin appeared to indicate that the above amendment broadens the claims. For this reason, Examiner Tolin indicated that such claim amendments could not be entered in the originally-filed application because the broadened claim scope necessitates a new search for prior art relevant to such amended claims. For this reason, these claim amendments are now being submitted in this paper which is filed as a part of a Request for Continued Examination (RCE). The Examiner is requested to perform an appropriate prior art search necessitated by the broadened claims.

If after further prior art search, a further claim amendment appears to be required, the Examiner is respectfully requested to call the undersigned to discuss such an amendment. In the above-mentioned telephone call, Examiner Tolin offered to make any such amendment (after approval by the undersigned) by an Examiner's Amendment, so as to allow this application to proceed to issue.

Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's statement, in paragraph 3 on page 2 of the above-identified Office Action, about lack of support for the word "annular." First, Applicant submits that the word "annular" was used (as per its normal meaning) to mean "ring-like." Such an inner "ring-like" region is illustrated in FIG. 2 of the originally-filed drawings, by a region free of circles, which region is labeled by reference numeral "36". The just-described region 36 separates inside protrusions 34b from peripheral protrusions 34a as stated in the originally-filed specification at page 6, line 2. The purpose of the just-described

SILICON VALLEY
PATENT GROUP LLP

2350 Mission College Blvd.
Suite 360
Santa Clara, CA 95054
(408) 982-8200
FAX (408) 982-8210

region 36 (along with cutouts) is to accommodate a frame 12 of FIG. 1, as stated in the originally-filed specification at page 6, line 1.

Although the just-described inner region 36 is shown in FIG. 2 as rectangular, Applicant respectfully submits that use of the word "annular" to describe such a region does not mean only a circular region. The word "annular" was used by the Applicant in its broad sense rather than a strict mathematical interpretation (as an area between two concentric circles). In any case, this word "annular" is now eliminated from the above-described claims, which are believed to be now broad enough to cover circular and non-circular embodiments.

Moreover, Applicant respectfully submits that although only rectangular embodiments are illustrated in the drawings of the current application, circular embodiments will be readily apparent to the skilled artisan from the originally-filed disclosure of the current application. Specifically, the Examiner's attention is drawn to the description at page 5, lines 10-12 which states that "in FIG. 2, the electronic component as well as plate 32 are rectangular in shape (e.g. square shape) although other shapes may be used in other embodiments (e.g. both could be circular or one circular and the other square)." Consider an embodiment wherein the electronic component and the plate are both round, and assume that frame 12 and hole 14 are also both round (as stated in the specification at page 2, lines 9-10). In such an embodiment, Applicant submits that it will be readily apparent to the skilled artisan, in view of the above, to use a round inner region (in order to "accommodate" the frame being round, and such "accommodation" is required as mentioned above in reference to the originally-filed specification at page 6, line 1). Note that variants of the just-described embodiment need not have a round electronic component and/or a round plate.

Applicant also draws the Examiner's attention to the related application 10/072,598 which was incorporated by reference at page 1, lines 6-9. Specifically, the related application was identified by the attorney docket no. M-12485 and by the title "A Fiber Guide Connected To A Heatsink Fastener". This related application currently has the same examiner, Examiner Tolin, and claims in the related application currently stand allowed. The Examiner is respectfully requested to consider the relevance to the current application, of the allowed claims in related application 10/072,598 and/or arguments for and against patentability thereof. Applicant concurrently submits herewith a form PTO-1449 and an accompanying Information Disclosure Statement (IDS), to assist the Examiner in doing so.

While the Examiner is requested to review the entire file history of the related application 10/072,598, Applicant respectfully draws the Examiner's attention to the

following statements in the originally-filed specification: (a) a statement on page 21, lines 30-31 that "frames can have other shapes (such as oval, circular or triangular) in other embodiments"; (b) a statement on page 21, lines 21-22 that "The frame may have a shape that depends on the heatsink and/or the electronic component to be cooled, for example a rectangular shape" and (c) a statement on page 5, lines 14-15 that "For example, frame 31 and hole 32 may each be of any other polygonal shape or even a circular shape."

In view of the above, Applicant submits that rectangular embodiments are merely exemplary of a more generic invention that is now being claimed by amended Claims 19-29 and 31-43. New Claims 45-49 are limited specifically to rectangular embodiments. Note that the word "rectangular" in these new claims is not used to require unequal sides, but is used in its broader sense to be inclusive of (and cover) a square shape (which is obtained as a further limitation on a rectangular shape by requiring that the sides be equal). The Examiner is respectfully requested to state his interpretation of the word "rectangular" on the record. New Claims 47-52 are believed to be patentable, although the Examiner is respectfully requested to independently confirm the same.


Claim 33 was rejected in paragraph 6 at the bottom of page 2 of the Office Action for reciting the inner annular region without antecedent basis. Accordingly, Applicant has amended Claim 33 to eliminate the words "inner" and "annular" and therefore believes this claim has been broadened. Claim 33 now requires a region free of protrusions. Amended Claim 33 is believed to be now in form for allowance, unless the Examiner finds new art.

Claim 35 was rejected in paragraph 6 at the bottom of page 2 of the Office Action for reciting both a cutout and an opening. Claim 35 has now been amended to recite a feature that can be either a cutout or an opening so that both are covered. Claim 35 is believed to be broadened by this amendment. Nonetheless, amended Claim 35 is believed to be now in form for allowance, unless the Examiner finds new art.

For the above reasons, Applicant respectfully requests allowance of all Claims 14, 16-29 and 31-52. Should the Examiner have any questions concerning this response, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned at (408) 982-8200, ext. 3.

**Via Express Mail Label No.
ER 205 704 744 US**

Respectfully submitted,


Omkar K. Suryadevara
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 36,320

SILICON VALLEY
PATENT GROUP LLP
2350 Mission College Blvd.
Suite 360
Santa Clara, CA 95054
(408) 982-8200
FAX (408) 982-8210